2. THE COCHIN MAINTENANCE ORDERS ENFORCEMENT BILL

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* I move that the Cochin Maintenance Orders Enforcement Bill be taken up and finally passed.

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government):* I second it.

Motion put and carried.

3. THE COCHIN CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* I beg to move that the Cochin Code of Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill be read in Council. The purpose of this Amendment is to bring the Cochin Code of Criminal Procedure on a par with the Code in British India. Our Code is not exactly on all fours with the British Indian Code. The amended section closely follows the British Indian Section about the procedure relating to summary trials and the main purpose of the amendment is to enable Magistrates to try summarily petty cases. Under the section as it now stands in the Cochin Code of Criminal Procedure, offences triable are summarily very few. Section 236 lays down such cases. Offences under the hackney carriages are not triable summarily now. Under the British Indian Code there are various offences for which trials can be had summarily. They are enumerated in Section 260 of the Criminal Procedure Code of British India. There, the following offences can be tried in a summary way: (*a*) offences not punishable with death, transportation or imprisonment for a term exceeding six months. (*b*) offences relating to weights and measures, offences under sections 264, 265, 266 of the Indian Penal Code, etc. Under our Code as it stands, offences relating to the use of false weights and measures cannot be tried summarily. But the British Code makes provision for the same.

The main purpose of the amendment is to bring our Code also in conformity with the provisions in British India for the purpose of speedy trial of minor offences.

The second amendment is to the effect that where in the course of a summary trial, it appears to the Magistrate or Bench that the case is one which is of a character which renders it undesirable that it should be tried summarily, the Magistrate or Bench shall recall any witnesses who may have been examined and proceed to rehear the case in a manner provided by this Code. Suppose in a small petty case, it is found that a complicated question of law arises and that it cannot be summarily disposed of. Even in such cases, the magistrates have got a discretion. That is a safeguard.

In trials under this chapter, the procedure prescribed for summons cases must be followed in summons cases, and the procedure prescribed for warrant cases must be followed in warrant cases, except where specific provisions have been made relating to procedure. No sentence of imprisonment for a term exceeding three months can be passed in the case of any conviction under this Chapter.

Government may authorise any bench magistrate to try offences summarily, to prepare the records or judgment in the cases by means of an officer appointed in this behalf by the court to which such bench is immediately subordinate. The record or judgment so prepared shall also be signed by each member of such bench taking part in the proceedings.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters):* What do you mean by the term 'prepare' ?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* Mere writing.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters):* Is it the same wording as is used in British India ?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* Yes. There are adequate safeguards provided by the law-makers in British India and we are only rendering petty offences triable summarily.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters):* They are all felonies,

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* Throughout British India, this has been the procedure adopted.

Mr. V. J. Mathai *(Planters):* What about depositions ?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* A Memorandum of the evidence is sufficient. Only magistrates who are specially empowered will get these powers. This will not lead to any miscarriage of justice or take away the adequate safeguards provided for under the amendment. Wherever there is failure of justice, the case will be remanded.

The House rose for lunch at 1-5 p.m. and re-assembled at 2-30 p.m. with M. R. Ry. K. Ayyappan Avl., Deputy President in the Chair.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate General):* In attempting to dissuss the principles of the Bill in some detail, I wish only to make the House understand that we are not making

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

any departure at all in the matter of the amendment. From that prevailing in British India. It is only in cases where no appeal lies that in summary trials a memorandum of the evidence can be taken. In all appealable cases, the evidence must be taken in full. And non-appealable cases are very few. Even where the imprisonment is for one day, it is appealable. It is only in cases where a fine of Rs. 50 is imposed that there is no appeal. The whole question turns upon as to whether it is not necessary that there should be a speedier disposal of such petty offences, with the safeguard that these powers will be invested upon magistrates who in the opinion of the government will discharge their duties efficiently. All magistrates do not get this power automatically. There is also a third safeguard. If the court itself feels in the course of enquiry, that a case triable summarily should not be so tried the court can have a regular trial. My submission to the House is that there is nothing new in this. The House may be pleased to allow this to be read in Council.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur)*: Sir, I rise to oppose some of the provisions of the Bill. The Bill as drafted takes in several sections some of which, according to me, can be summarily tried. But with regard to some, it will be too hard if a summary trial is allowed. Before I proceed to the discussion of this point, I think it is necessary for me to explain to those Members of this House who are not accustomed to legal procedure the distinction between a trial of a smmons case and a warrant case. In a summary trial, you first proceed by asking the accused by reading out the charge whether he has committed the crime or not. He has to answer, yes or no. Then the trial proceeds. There is no duty on the part of the court to frame a specific charge against him. There is also no duty to post the case for defence evidence on a separate day. The witnesses for the complainant and the accused are summoned together. After the witnesses of the complainant are examined, the court can immediately pass on to the examination of the defence and the whole trial is closed. With regard to warrant cases, there are clear distinctions, in procedure. In the first place, the accused is not asked, as soon as he comes to court, whether he has committed the crime or not. It is incumbent on the court first to examine the witnesses for the prosecution and only when the court is primarily satisfied that there is a *prima facie* case against him that the court frames the charges; and then alone the accused is called upon to answer the charge. So far, the procedure will be alright. After framing the charge, there is a material difference between the trial of a summons case and a warrant case. In the case of a warrant case, after the charge is framed, the accused is given a right to further cross-examine the witnesses. And after further cross-examination it is posted for defence to another day. The defence witnesses are called in then.

There is another distinction pointed out by the Advocate General that in the case of a summary trial, the court is not bound to take up the whole deposition, but only a memorandum. But it is not applicable where there is only a revision.

Now, the Bill contemplates authorising the court to try summarily many of the sections of the penal code. According to me there are some sections which could well be tried as summons case. But there are very important sections, for example, hurt, misappropriation, receiving of stolen property, mischief, house trespass, criminal intimidation, etc. Offences of this sort, Sir, involve complicated issues. For example, in a case of trespass, it is very difficult for the court to decide whether it is a case which could be convicted. There may be some elements of trespass present; but civil disputes often come in. The experience in criminal court would show that it is only a few percentage of cases that are really convicted when the prosecution is for criminal trespass. And it is essential that in trials of such cases, the accused should have sufficient time and opportunity to follow the prosecution evidence and then alone he should be called upon to put forward his evidence which may very often be of a civil character. According to me, in trials of these important crimes covered by these important sections, it will be too hard and it will meet with severe injustice if a summary procedure is to be followed. The Advocate-General was inviting the attention of this House to the fact that it is only where the punishment is less than 6 months that summary trial is to be followed. According to me, this makes no difference at all. To any man who courts jail, it makes no difference whether conviction is for six months or for one year. As a matter of fact, in several cases people are fined under section 303. People take it as a degradation in status and position. Such cases are very hotly contested. It is not the quantum of punishment; it is the fact whether he is punished that matters. Therefore, what I would submit to the House is, of the several sections covered by this Bill, it would be advisable for the Government to delete some of these important sections which involve very complicated questions of law and fact and which would naturally call upon us to stand in defence of the accused to give him a fair trial. Now, on a perusal of the amendment to clause 236, covered by clause 2 of the Bill, it would appear that except the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

offence covered by sub-clause (*m*) and offences under section 20 of the Cattle Trespass Act, almost all the important sections of the Penal Code are covered by the clauses. Offences relating to weights and measures according to me can well be tried as summons cases,—the other sections are theft, under sections 359, 360, 361, dishonest misappropriation of property, receiving or retaining stolen property etc., mischief, under section 407, house trespass under section 428, and offences under sections 431, 433, 434, 436 and 437 of the same Code—these sections are several varieties of house trespass;—insult with intent to provoke a breach of the peace, abetment of any of the foregoing offences and attempt to commit any of the foregoing offences. According to me Sir, it appears that except for offences punishable under Weights and Measures and Cattle Trespass Act, it will be really unfair for the accused if we are to call upon them to stand a summary trial.

I will pass on to section 237. The section says 'Government may empower bench magistrates to try some of the offences'. I have absolutely no quarrel with trials of offences covered by Hackney Carriage Act and Nuisance Act. But I have serious objection to empower bench magistrates to try offences covered by the other sections mentioned in the clause. I shall for the information of the House state what offences are covered by the sections mentioned in the Bill—use of criminal force, mischief, criminal trespass, insult provoking a breach of peace—these are some of the sections which according to me will be very inadvisable to empower the bench magistrates to try. As I submitted before this House, sections like Mischief, Criminal Trespass, Insult, etc., very often involve very delicate questions of law which it would be too much for the bench magistrates to grasp and too much for the Government to expect that there will be a fair deal of justice. There are some offences covered by the sections which can rightly go to the bench magistrates court. Therefore, I would feel that this Bill requires serious consideration and it would be only fair to the public that we make distinctions between one section and another section and modify the bill by deleting some of the sections. I have not examined the question whether this Bill is perfectly analogous with that in British India. Except for the fact that there is a law prevailing in British India, I can find absolutely no justification whatsoever, in including several sections covering very important offences in this Bill. I therefore earnestly request the Government to reconsider the position, and if necessary, refer the Bill to a Select Committee and make necessary modifications.

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi)*: I rise to support the motion. My ground for supporting this Bill is very short. It is the very ground referred to by my friend Mr. Devassy, the Hon'ble Member for Adur. This law is in force in British India. That is a strong factor which has persuaded me to support this. Now the idea that prevails in my mind is that there are certain fundamental subjects where we must have an All-India Legislation, for instance, Criminal and Civil Procedure Code; Transfer of property; Contract; Limitation and such fundamental laws must be similar to the laws in British India. We must have one uniform law. I greatly appreciate the Advocate-General. It is quite desirable that we must have an all-India legislation and I remember those days when he was working with us as the leader of the Democratic Party. He still retains some of those ideas. Some innocent people might suffer which we cannot prevent. So long as there is human ingenuity, some dishonest people may escape the clutches of law. From the institution of the Criminal Procedure Code there have been such instances. What we should do is we should try our best to safeguard such provisions. Our people in British Cochin are having the same law. Is there any difference between the men here and the men in British Cochin. Occasionally there may be travesty of justice, and some innocent people might suffer. We are hearing of United India, all India, etc. I am against this Pakistan of Jinnah. Jinnah says we must have Pakistan. I am against it. We must have a United India. Therefore what I submit is we must have a uniform administration of Justice. I know in Travancore there is a Criminal Procedure Code. What they have done there is they have copied the words of the British Indian Procedure Code; but the sections are differently numbered. Why not you correctly copy it. We have to copy British India. When compared to British India, what is Cochin State? It is only a small point. We are not in a position to influence the British Indian Legislation. There may be a time when federation comes and our representatives will be sitting in the assembly at Delhi; then they may be able to influence them.

Mr. M. L. Joseph *(Latin-Christians-Cranganur)*: Why then waste so much of labour and time. Simply copy it down and get His Highness' sanction for it.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. A. V. Moothedan *(Chalakkudi):* The Advocate-General considered that if this Bill is brought in the Council, people will become aware of the change of law. If it is published in the Gazette, nobody will read it. Who is looking into the Gazette. We must have an all-India legislation. If my friend can support some portions of the proposed amendment, why should he oppose some others. I cannot understand that. He can take up thr whole or reject the whole. Therefore, without entering into the merits of the case, we must have a comprehensive all-India legislation. I support the motion.

Motion put and carried

Secretary to the Council : The title of the Bill is The Cochin Criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) Bill.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur):* I move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. M. L. Joseph *(Latin-Christians-Cranganur):* I second it.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* For certain obvious reasons, I beg to oppose this. We have not exercised any of our ingenuity in drafting the Bill. We closely followed British India on this point. I am sure the non-official members will appreciate the view taken by the Government, that there is no necessity to refer the Bill to a select committee. We have agreed with the Government of India that the Criminal Procedure Code will be brought into line with the Indian Code.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ എസ്സ്. പണിക്കർ : On a point of information. Sir, ബ്രിട്ടീഷിൻഡ്യയിൽ പാസ്സാക്കീട്ടുള്ള ആക്ടുകളൊക്കെ ഇവിടെ പാസ്സാക്കാമോ ?

മിസ്റ്റർ എം. ശിവരാമമേനോൻ : ചിലതൊക്കെ ഇവിടെ പാസ്സാക്കീട്ടുണ്ട്; ഇവിടെ വേണ്ടതെല്ലാം ഇവിടെ പാസാക്കാം.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur):* I really appreciate the frank confession of the Advocate-General. With regard to such matters, I would request the Government not to bring such legislation before this House. There is absolutely no use of discussing and wasting much time and labour, if you are simply copying British India. If the Government is going to to follow that procedure in spite of the fact that it may undermine several privileges, I am prepared to withdraw my motion.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* We do not want to take away the right of the people. Government wanted to know the views of the House on the Bill. It has been done. No case for a deviation from the Indian Act has been made out.

Mr. A. B. Salem *(Mattancheri):* I also oppose this motion to refer the Bill to a select committee. This Bill does not allow any amendment to be brought because it is a Bill that brings the Criminal Procedure Code in line with the Criminal Procedure Code in British India. Therefore there is no scope for any individuality to be brought into play in the select committee. What is the select committee going to do except wasting some more time and some more public money? Nothing else can be done. If there is scope for amending any particular section in any particular manner or implementing any particular idea, certainly it should go to a select committee. Otherwise it will be mere waste of public funds and time.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur):* May I bring one fact before this House where this House has thought it advisable to effect changes even with regard to laws analogous to British Indian laws. The Government has referred the matter and got sanction to discuss the Bill. I refer particularly to the Insolvency Amendment Bill brought before this House. It is not proper to shut out the views and detailed considerations of the measures of the Bill. If the government after examining this question in the Select Committee finds that the decisions of the Select Committee are reasonable, it will be only proper for the Government to make necessary references to the Government of India and see whether our views could not be accepted. I do not mind my motion being lost; I press my motion.

Deputy President : Government can accede to the motion for reference to the Select Committee. Government can have more confidential talk and if possible the Select Committee can be brought to accept the position of the Government. They may recommend the whole bill to be accepted as it is. My position is, Government is not going to lose.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* In this matter, the issue involved is so very trifling that it is not necessary to refer it to a Select Committee. If a large issue is involved,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

a reference may be necessary. This Bill does not involve any such thing. This Bill has been in vogue in British India for a long time. If there is any question of principle involved in the sense that it will prejudicially affect the accused, then Government would agree to changes being made in the select committee. Adjournment for examination of defence witnesses and even issue of summons for their appearance are granted as a matter of course. The interests of justice will not be jeopardised. In that harmonious way we are having justice here. So my view is that it need not be referred to a Select Committee.

The question whether the Bill may be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members was put and lost.—

Members
1. Advocate-General
2. Mr. M. L. Joseph
3. Mr. V. J. Mathai
4. Mr. A. V. Moothedan
5. Mr. A. B. Salem.

Mr. M. K. Devassy *(Adur)*: A poll. Sir.

Ayes	*Noes*
1. Mr. C. K. Nayar	1. Rama Varmha Tampuran
2. Mr. C. V. Iyyu	2. Mr. A. Madhava Prabhu
3. Mr. M. K. Devassy	3. Rao Sahib I. N. Menon
4. Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar	4. Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon
5. Mr. K. S. Panicker	5. Mr. Parambi Lonappan
6. Mr. T. S. Ramachandra Ayyar	6. Mr. P. V. Raphael
7. Mr. K. R. Ramakrishnan	7. Mr. M. Raman Menon
8. Mr. M. L. Joseph	8. Mr. C. J. Mathew
9. Mr. C. K. S. Moni	9. Dr. T. Verghese
	10. Mr. T. Narayana Menon
	11. Khan Sahib Y. Muhammad Roshan
	12. Mr. M. Sivarama Menon
	13. Mr. A. B. Salem
	14. Mr. A. V. Moothedan
	15. Mr. N. Govinda Pai
	16. Mr. V. K. Kutty
	17. Mr. P. K. Krishnan

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General)*: I request that the President may be pleased to suspend S. O. 32.

Deputy President: S. O. 32 suspended.
Sections 2 to 5 put and carried.
Section 1 put and carried.
Title and Preamble put and carried.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General)*: The Bill may be taken up and finally passed tomorrow.

Motion put and carried

4. THE COCHIN INCOME-TAX ACT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General)*: I beg to move that the Cochin Income-tax Act (Amendment) Bill be read in Council.

Mr. M. L. Joseph *(Latin-Christians-Cranganur)*: May I know whether this also is brought in pursuance of the general agreement which has been spoken of just now?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General)*: That is beside the point. Each Bill has to be considered on its merits. This amendment is a very simple one. This is an amendment to section 20 of the Income-tax Act which was referred to a Select Committee appointed by this House. The Income-tax Law as you are aware is a highly technical piece of legislation and there is a small slip in section 20. "Where a person is not a resident of Cochin and is a subject of Cochin, or of any other Indian State or of British India," was the wording that was adopted. In the British Act, the wording is quite different. British subject is defined in section 22 of the British Nationality Act. That clause was omitted and instead of that the term " subject of British India " was added. This is a non-controversial amendment.

Mr. C. J. Mathew *(Joint Secretary to Government)*: I second it.

Motion put and carried

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

APPENDIX II

THE COCHIN CODE OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Preamble.—Whereas it is expedient further to amend the Cochin Code of Criminal Procedure, II of 1086, it is hereby enacted as follows.—

1. (1) **Short title and commencement.**—This Act may be called the Cochin Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Act of 111 .

(2) It shall come into force at once.

2. **Substitution of sections 236 and 237.**—For sections 236 and 237 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, hereinafter referred to as the Code, substitute the following, namely.—

"236. (1) **Power to try summarily.**—Notwithstanding anything contained in this Code.—

(*a*) the District Magistrate,

(*b*) any Magistrate of the first class specifically empowered in this behalf by Government, and

(*c*) any Bench of Magistrates invested with the powers of a Magistrate of the first class and especially empowered in this behalf by Government,

may, if he or they think fit, try in a summary way all or any of the following offences.—

(*a*) offences not punishable with death or imprisonment for a term exceeding six months ;

(*b*) offences relating to weights and measures under sections 240, 241 and 242 of the Cochin Penal Code ;

(*c*) hurt, under section 303 of the same Code ,

(*d*) theft, under section 359, 360 or 361 of the same Code, where the value of the property stolen does not exceed fifty rupees ;

(*e*) dishonest misappropriation of property under section 383 of the same Code, where the value of the property misappropriated does not exceed fifty rupees ;

(*f*) receiving or retaining stolen property under section 391 of the same Code, where the value of such property does not exceed fifty rupees ;

(*g*) assisting in the concealment or disposal of stolen property, under section 394 of the same Code, where the value of such property does not exceed fifty rupees ;

(*h*) mischief, under section 407 of the same Code ;

(*i*) house-trespass, under section 428, and offences under sections 431, 433, 434, 436 and 437 of the same Code ;

(*j*) insult with intent to provoke a breach of the peace, under section 484, and criminal intimidation, under section 486, of the same Code ;

(*k*) abetment of any of the foregoing offences ;

(*l*) an attempt to commit any of the foregoing offences ; when such attempt is an offence ;

(*m*) offences under section 20 of the Cochin Cattle Trespass Act, III of 1071.

(2) When in the course of a summary trial it appears to the Magistrate or Bench that the case is one which is of a character which renders it undesirable that it should be tried summarily, the Magistrate or Bench shall recall any witnesses who may have been examined and proceed to re-hear the case in manner provided by this Code.

237. **Power to invest Magistrate and Bench of Magistrates with summary powers.**—Government may confer on any Magistrate or Bench of Magistrates power to try summarily all or any of the following offences.—

(*a*) offences against the Cochin Penal Code, sections 253, 254, 255, 261, 262, 265, 266, 268, 269, 270, 303, 314, 316, 321, 332, 406, 427 and 484 ;

(*b*) offences against the Cochin Municipal Act, XVIII of 1113, the conservancy clauses of the Police Act I of 1058, the Hackney Carriage Act, II of 1098 and offences under the Nuisances Act, IV of 1098 which are punishable with fine or with imprisonment for a term not exceeding one month with or without fine ;

(*c*) abetment of any of the foregoing offences ;

(*d*) an attempt to commit any of the foregoing offences, when such attempt is an offence.

237-A. (1) **Procedure of summons and warrant cases applicable.**—In trials under this Chapter, the procedure prescribed for summons cases shall be followed in summons cases, and the procedure prescribed for warrant cases shall be followed in warrant case, except as hereinafter mentioned.

(2) **Limit of imprisonment.**—No sentence of imprisonment for a term exceeding three months shall be passed in the case of any conviction under this Chapter".

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

3. **Amendment of section 238.**—To clause (*b*) of section 238 of the Code, add the following, namely.—

"and in cases coming under clause (*d*), clause (*e*), clause (*f*) or clause (*g*) of sub-section (1) of section 236 the value of the property in respect of which the offence has been committed".

4. **Amendment of section 240.**—Section 240 of the Code shall be re-numbered as sub-section (1) and the following shall be added as sub-section (2) to (4).—

"(2) Government may authorise any Bench of Magistrates empowered to try offences summarily to prepare the aforesaid record or judgment by means of an officer appointed in this behalf by the Court to which such Bench is immediately subordinate, and the record or judgment so prepared shall be signed by each member of such Bench present taking part in the proceedings.

(3) If no such authorization be given, the record prepared by a member of the Bench and signed as aforesaid shall be the proper record.

(4) If the Bench differ in opinion, any dissentient member may write a separate judgment".

5. **Amendment of Schedule IV.**—In Schedule IV of the Code—

Under the powers with which a Magistrate of the first, second and third class may be invested by Government, add the following as items (11a), (9a) and (6) respectively.—

"powers to try summarily, section 237".

Statement of Objects and Reasons

Chapter XXII of the Cochin Code of Criminal Procedure provides for the trial of certain cases summarily by Magistrates. According to that chapter only offences against the Municipal Act and the conservancy clause of the Police Act and offences against the Nuisances Act which are punishable with fine or with imprisonment not exceeding one month are triable summarily. Thus according to the existing provisions of law the number of offences that can be tried summarily are very limited. It is, therefore, considered that with a view to the speedy and efficient disposal of cases, it would be better to adapt the British Code with suitable modifications. Hence the Bill.

Huzur Secretariat,
Law Department,
3rd November 1942.

K. S. RAGHAVAN
Secretary to the Council

APPENDIX III

THE COCHIN INCOME-TAX ACT (AMENDMENT) BILL

Preamble.—Whereas it is expedient to amend the Cochin Income-tax Act, VI of 1117; It is hereby enacted as follows.—

1. (1) **Short title and commencement.**—This Act may be called the Cochin Income-tax (Amendment) Act of 111 .

(2) It shall be deemed to have come into force with effect from the first day of Chingam 1117.

2. **Amendment to section 20.**—In sub-section (1) of section 20 of the Act for the words "of British India" the words "a British subject as defined in section 27 of the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act, 1914" shall be substituted.

Statement of Objects and Reasons

Under section 17 of the Indian Income-tax Act which corresponds to section 20 of our Act, all non-resident British subjects as defined in the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act are liable to pay tax only at the average rate applicable to their world income. Under our Act this concession is extended only to subjects of British India and not to British subjects who have therefore to pay at the maximum rate. It is considered necessary to extend the concession to British subjects. Hence the Bill.

The Huzur Secretariat,
Law Department,
12th November 1942.
27th Thulam 1118.

K. S. RAGHAVAN
Secretary to the Council

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly